

to be a registered voter. There were others who appeared to testify on this bill in favor of expanding the voter registratin list. Mike Boyle of Omaha looked into the situation and said he had no problem with that. He said in Douglas County I checked it and it would be possible to merge those two lists without a great deal of difficulty, frankly, probably not even involving the county treasurer or other public officials. Mr. Mike Whetstone appeared on the bill and discussed the uniform age of majority in the State of Nebraska. That would solve a lot of our problems. Kandra Hahn, the Clerk of the District Court of Lancaster County testified and in her testimony she said we accept the judgments of eighteen year olds when it comes to votes and then we turn around and submit that that judgment is not appropriate as a juror and she echoed Mr. Whetstone's plea for uniform age of majority. She estimated in Lancaster County they could increase from the present number of 94,000 registered voters eligible for jury duty, they could increase that up to 125 to 150 thousand people eligible to serve on a jury. Other states have examined this and have tried it with great success. Kansas and Colorado, our nearest neighbors, they use similar systems. The hour is late this morning so I won't belabor the point. I guess what we are doing is trying to decide whether or not we want to expand this on a fair basis so that we can have more people involved in the jury selection process, not just registered voters. There is testimony to indicate that people won't register to vote because they simply do not want to be called for jury duty. At a question of why do we go to driver's licenses as an expansion list. Well, we can't go to social security because that is not available. City directories are not complete. They are missing low income individuals. As far as the census, the federal list is not available. Motor vehicle registration, it is institutional. There are no corporate listings and there is no age identification. Real estate tax, there is a commercial bias and there are commercial properties and there is a male bias. The state income tax list, that again is not...that is male biased. Telephone directory, male bias. Utility customers, if you don't own the property, again it is not a crosssection of everyone who should serve. So I don't know if Senator Landis has any comments on this but I would urge the adoption of these amendments to LB 234 so we can have a more complete jury selection system in this state and modernize our system as we now have it and this would only add to the bill. The exemptions would still be in there and I think we would have a more complete bill as a result of these two years of study.